Islamic Terrorism justified by the Economist (2007)

In two previous articles, I denounced a provocative forgery that was published in the Economist (under a subversive title "The Meaning of Freedom") in favor of the Turkish foreign minister's wife. Accepting the headscarf as Islamic is sheer commitment to Islamic terrorism, as the imposition of headscarf on women is a pillar of the Islamic terror theorists. This attitude exposes the Economist's columnist gravely. The two articles have been recently republished and can be found here:
Put a Headscarf on Elizabeth II, not on Turkey's First Lady! (2007)
https://megalommatis.wordpress.com/put-a-headscarf-on-elizabeth-ii-not-on-turkeys-first-lady-2007/
Islamic Extremist Propaganda by the Economist (2007)
https://megalommatis.wordpress.com/islamic-extremist-propaganda-by-the-economist-2007/

In this article, I will further analyze excerpts that testify to the columnist's absolute naivety and clear misunderstanding of the politically extremist agenda of the dangerous Turkish premier and his foreign minister. Trying to support what he gullibly enough considers as democratic right of a majority party to elect a president, the author of this majestic misinformation helps extend the powers of a venomous enemy of the Western world and of all the world's civilizations, namely a person that is far more dangerous than Hitler.

We can imagine what will ensue, in case Erdogan prevails in Turkey, by taking into consideration that, in contrast with Hitler's impact on his few

friends (Italy, Japan, Hungary, Bulgaria, Romania, the Palestinians and more particularly Mufti Husseini of Jerusalem), Erdogan's impact will potentially be exercised on more than 1.3 million people!

Democracy or Secularism? Democracy is Secularism!

Many pro-liberal European and American politicians, businessmen, and journalists tried to view the present ideological confrontation in Turkey as a predicament of the type: 'Democracy or Secularism'.

By itself, this testifies to the dreadful collapse of the Western societies and the leading groups of powers, which shape decision making procedures therein; to some extent, the confusion is due to the collapse of the Soviet system, and the rise of the religious feeling / concern.

Many people in the Western societies find secularism as reason of the existing moral collapse, but this is due to a rather late misinterpretation; secularism does not mean atheism, rejection of all the existing religions, agnosticism or indifference to moral and religious issues. Secularism means a state and a society that are 'religiously neutral'.

As such, they have no religious 'contents', therefore involving separation between religion and state.

Secularism is not an ideology, as it is content-empty; it is a democratic approach to, and solution of, conflicts and strives among the followers of various religious systems, cults, and faiths. It implies absolute respect of the 'Other' in a society whereby various religions and cultures coexist.

When first introduced, before more than 100 years, secularism as concept was thought to be part of the French Freemasonic anticlericalism, and so it was.

However, with all the changes that have occurred ever since, and with the gradual amalgamation of peoples and ethnic groups all over the world, secularism –void of ideological contents and disconnected from evolutionist, atheist, and materialist biases– is by definition the only means able to help many religious, ethnic and linguistic groups cohabitate peacefully, without one of them dominating the others.

Taken into consideration that few countries have remained intact of immigration during the past decades, we can realize that modern societies need secularism as key to democracy. It is only secularism itself, the secular society, the secular legislation, and the secular practice that help avert the imposition of a Catholic majority model over the Muslims, the Protestants, the Orthodox, the Jews, the Buddhists, the Hindus, and the atheists of France. In the same way, it is only secularism itself, the secular society, the secular legislation, and the secular practice that help avert the imposition of a Sunni

Muslim majority model over the Shia (Alevis), Aramaeans, Armenians, Orthodox Greeks, Jews, and atheists of Turkey.

Respect for the non-practicing followers of a religion

Furthermore, secularism helps alleviate another –perhaps even more critical– issue of our modern societies. If we do not take into consideration the existing various religious groups and minorities, and if we do not take into account atheists and agnostics, there is still a great obstacle against the adoption of a fully religious society in our days.

Without rejecting the existence of a Supreme Being and without ideologically opposing their religion, hundreds of millions of people belong to their religions, without however practicing them! This generated another social category that democratic sensitivity obliges us to take into consideration. We should not necessarily view them as one group, but we should take into account their concerns, approaches and problems.

These are the people who go fishing on Fridays in order to avoid paying a quasi-compulsory visit to the mosque; these are the people who sleep as late as possible on Sunday morning, so that they have no possibility to attend a religious service in the church. Democratic society implies that they must feel no constrain to do 'something' they do not want to, they must feel no threat if they do not do 'it', and they must be sure that no reprisals of any sort may happen to them in case they do not practice 'it', namely if they do not practice their religion.

The non-practicing followers of the prevailing religion in a country must be offered every possible support to live in peace and without any socially imposed obligation and/or fear. A religiously unidimensional society cannot become the alibi of camouflaged religious propaganda that through various ways helps gradually convert the non-practicing followers of that religion into practicing and fervent ones.

The only means to address the issue is a secular society.

That is why secularism has risen to top priority for any government in the world to implement; secularism is the epitome of democracy, its foremost pillar.

Wherever secularism disappears, lack of respect for the 'Other' and fanaticism rise and proliferate, expand and prevail.

In the light of this introductory note, I will now continue examining the Economist's falsification that I already castigated in two earlier articles. I already stressed the point that the Turkish foreign minister's wife's headscarf is not a matter of apparel, but of the Islamic terror's supreme symbol. In the

vicious article, the misinformation and the pro-Erdogan propaganda reach a peak with the following paragraph:

"But the challenge which Mrs. Gül's apparel poses for Turkey's strict secularism is more than imaginary. Until now, neither she nor the wife of any other top politician in the ruling Justice and Development (AK) Party has been welcome in the chamber of parliament, the presidential palace or any military premises—because as devout Muslim ladies, they cover their heads. The idea of a scarved mistress of the presidential residence, guarded by soldiers trained to uphold secularism, delights some Turks and enrages others."

Look at the perfidious expression: 'soldiers trained to uphold secularism'!

Vicious and pathetic!

Soldiers are never trained to 'uphold' principles of their societies, but mainly to back up the national defense and, at times, the social order and discipline. To discredit and vulgarize secularism, the columnist composes a sentence in which he brings a social ideal and principle close to the guards of a presidential residence!

And what does a ludicrous sentence like this "the idea of a scarved mistress ….. delights some Turks and enrages others" mean?

It is as if we dare say the following:
"the idea of a German Chancellor who in 2007 would be follower of Hitler …… delights some Germans and enrages others".

An impossible sentence!

Principles matter; emotions do not. A correspondent is expected either to close his/her mouth or to formulate morally acceptable sentences.

Anything that is morally sinister is to be castigated.

And the bogus-Islamic headscarf is morally sinister.

You don't know Islam; close your mouth, instead of committing suicide!

This is what a well-versed into Islam scholar or an illuminated Muslim would say to the comical columnist of the Economist. This is valid more particularly about the next paragraph:

"In almost every other part of the Muslim world, controversy over female headgear is growing. Turkey and Tunisia are at one end of the Muslim

spectrum; both ban female civil servants, as well as students in state schools, from covering their hair. One Turkish judge was nearly assassinated after decreeing that teachers could not wear scarves even on their way to work. But in Saudi Arabia and Iran, the rules go the other way. No woman may appear in public with more than face and hands exposed."

It is the same approach and irresponsible attitude as earlier; there are some who are delighted and there are some who are enraged! There are some countries that do not accept and there are some countries that impose headscarf!

This childish nonsense does not inform the Western reader about the social contextualization and the social-behavioral ramifications of the attitude towards the headscarf; and yet, what truly matters for the unaware Western reader is to know what it means for a woman to wear headscarf in this or in that country, what the consequences are in her daily life, and what her social status is; and similarly for those, who do not wear headscarf – wherever this is legally or socially possible.

The columnist should speak about the interconnectedness between headscarf and domestic slavery, between headscarf and excision, between headscarf and female harassment.

Instead of this, we go through a ridiculous attempt to form an imaginative field of semiotics whereby, as in the Western societies, people know the world in contrasting terms only (like the scheme Left–Center–Right); similarly but very erroneously, the Muslim world is portrayed as oscillating between two extremes, with Turkey being the one, Saudi Arabia (or Afghanistan) being the other, and with Egypt, Sudan, Nigeria and Pakistan being in-between. All this consists in first, over-simplification and second, absence of historical truth.

What starts as ludicrous ends up as criminal; this is so because there are issues of Human Rights involved; and in that case only Turkey's legislation is acceptable and commendable – not extreme! In striking contrast, almost the rest of the Muslim world is just inhuman and barbaric.

Note: Qajar dynasty painting; Muslim women throughout History did not wear the headscarf that today's Satanic sheikhs want to impose, functioning as silly agents of the MI6, the CIA, and other Western countries' secret services.

By Prof. Dr. Muhammad Shamsaddin Megalommatis
Published: 5/22/2007